

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION

FRACTUS, S.A.

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,  
et al.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Civil Action No. 6:09-cv-203 (LED-JDL)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**DEFENDANTS' SURREPLY ON FRACTUS' MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER  
UNDER RULE 26(c) REGARDING ITS P.R. 3-1 INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS**

Fractus in its Reply (Dkt. 396) fails to address several key reasons why its Infringement Contentions should not be afforded confidential treatment.

First, as it did in its opening brief (Dkt. 392), Fractus alleges that the test data in its Infringement Contentions was generated at considerable expense to Fractus and is somehow “valuable.” *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 396 at 5. However, Fractus has made no attempt in either its opening brief or reply brief to establish how or why that data is so valuable or to provide the cost of generating it.<sup>1</sup> The argument is a red herring, and the reality is that the “value” of the data (or, more precisely, Fractus’ graphical representations of data which reveal very little actual data) is *only* as a component of Fractus’ litigation positions, in order to purportedly make a showing that certain of its claim limitations are met. There is no technical or other commercial value to Defendants, or in the marketplace in general, in the data generated by Fractus.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Of course, the high cost of generating non-confidential litigation pleadings, such as a brief or an expert declaration, does not in and of itself render a pleading confidential.

<sup>2</sup> Notably, Fractus has not denied that this data was prepared solely for purposes of its infringement contentions, and not in connection with any other aspects of its business. Fractus failed to establish, or even allege, that it is in the business of testing antennas in the marketplace  
*footnote continued on next page...*

Second, even setting aside that Fractus cannot explain to this Court how the handful of graphical representations of its data at issue has value outside of the litigation, Fractus completely failed to address the alleged confidentiality of the vast majority of its Infringement Contentions that is information *other than* the representations of its test data. Indeed, in footnote 3 of its Reply, Fractus concedes that it has no basis at all to seek protection for that other information which includes the public language of its patent claims matched up with public information about Defendants' products (primarily photos), public information about wireless industry standards, and other public information.

Third, Fractus argues that Defendants have not shown good reason for disclosure of the Infringement Contentions. However, in accordance with the Protective Order, it is *Fractus'* burden to show that the information should be maintained as confidential – not the other way around. Dkt. 266 at ¶ 5 (“the burden of proof shall lie with the producing party [*i.e.*, Fractus] to establish that the information is, in fact, properly designated as CONFIDENTIAL”). Fractus plainly did not meet its burden. Fractus is therefore no more entitled to an explanation of how Defendants plan to use the Infringement Contentions than Defendants are entitled to a list of the names of people to whom Fractus distributes copies of any other non-confidential pleading or document in this case.

Again, Fractus did not even attempt to explain how or why the data or representations thereof are valuable and should be suppressed (including by failing to cite any authority or precedent holding that a plaintiff's infringement contentions can be protected confidential

---

and/or selling those test results across the industry. The reason Defendants may share the Infringement Contentions with others, *e.g.*, suppliers, has nothing to do with any technical value in that test data, and everything to do with properly educating other interested parties about the details of Fractus' infringement assertions in this litigation as Defendants see fit.

information).<sup>3</sup> Fractus likewise did not demonstrate how or why it would be harmed by the submission of that data to the PTO. The truth of the matter is that the only potential harm to Fractus is not in connection with its business, but in connection with its litigation strategy.

In any event, Defendants have shown at least one highly important use of the contentions – sharing them with the PTO in a reexamination. As discussed in Defendants’ opposition, it will be important for the PTO to understand during reexamination just how broadly Fractus is trying to read its patent claims in this case. Fractus’ Infringement Contentions are plainly material information as they are admissions from Fractus that its claims, to the extent they could possibly be construed as reading on Defendants’ products, would read directly on hundreds of prior art references. The reexamination proceeding can provide helpful data points for this Court (as well as for the parties), and may aid in significantly narrowing the issues in this case. Ultimately, the Defendants simply want to avoid being caught between competing positions – narrow claim positions in the PTO but broad claim positions in this litigation – and submission of the Infringement Contentions to the PTO will be an important preventative measure in that respect.

Finally, Fractus addresses ¶ 4(e) of the Protective Order, which expressly provides that “**Non-Confidential Information**” shall include “information that has been discerned through legal examination of the accused product itself without the use of defendants’ Protected, Confidential, or Highly Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes Only Information,” only to say that its plain meaning should not be applied. Dkt. 396 at 3-4. However, the information Fractus now seeks to protect, is precisely the information that ¶ 4(e) says is *not* confidential.

---

<sup>3</sup> Indeed, there is no such precedent; Fractus is, by its motion, asking this Court to set a radical new precedent regarding the protection of a plaintiff’s litigation positions.

For the foregoing reasons, Defendants<sup>4</sup> respectfully request that the Court deny Fractus' motion for a protective order in its entirety.

Date: May 26, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Neil P. Sirota, with permission by  
Michael E. Jones

Michael E. Jones  
State Bar No. 10929400  
mikejones@potterminton.com  
Allen F. Gardner  
State Bar No. 24043679  
allengardner@potterminton.com  
Potter Minton, P.C.  
110 N. College Ave., Suite 500  
Tyler, Texas 75702  
Tel: (903) 597-8311  
Fax: (903) 593-0846

Neil P. Sirota, State Bar No. 2562155  
neil.sirota@bakerbotts.com  
Chang Sik Kim, State Bar No. 4213021  
changsik.kim@bakekrbotts.com  
Eric J. Faragi, State Bar No. 4300687  
Eric.faragi@bakerbotts.com  
Robert L. Maier, State Bar No. 4123246  
robert.maier@bakerbotts.com  
BAKER BOTTS LLP  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, NY 10112-4498  
Tel: (212) 408-2500  
Fax: (212) 408-2501

---

<sup>4</sup> The following defendants all join in this Surreply: Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC, Samsung Electronics Research Institute, Samsung Semiconductor Europe GMBH, Pantech Wireless, Inc., Pantech Co., Ltd., Kyocera Wireless Corp., Kyocera Communications, Inc., Kyocera Corp., Palm, Inc., HTC Corp., HTC America, Inc., UTStarcom, Inc., LG Electronics, Inc., LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc., and LG Electronics MobileComm U.S.A.

Michael J. Barta, State Bar No. 431663  
Michael.barta@bakerbotts.com  
BAKER BOTTS LLP  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7703  
Fax: (202) 585-1058

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS  
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.;  
SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
AMERICA, LLC; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS  
RESEARCH INSTITUTE; AND SAMSUNG  
SEMICONDUCTOR EUROPE GMBH**

/s/ Winstol D. Carter, Jr.

(with permission by Michael E. Jones)

Winstol D. Carter, Jr.  
wcarter@morganlewis.com  
James Leroy Beebe  
jbeebe@morganlewis.com  
Morgan Lewis & Bockius  
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 4200  
Houston, TX 77002  
Tel: (713) 890-5000  
Fax: (713) 890-5001

Bradford A. Cangro  
bcangro@morganlewis.com  
Collin W. Park  
cpark@morganlewis.com  
John D. Zele  
jzele@morganlewis.com  
Thomas E. Nelson  
tnelson@morganlewis.com  
Morgan Lewis & Brockius - D.C.  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N W  
Washington, DC 20004  
Tel: (202) 739-3000  
Fax: (202) 739-3001

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS LG  
ELECTRONICS, INC., LG ELECTRONICS  
U.S.A., INC., AND LG ELECTRONICS  
MOBILECOMM U.S.A., INC.**

/s/ Melissa Richards Smith

(with permission by Michael E. Jones)

Melissa Richards Smith  
melissa@gillamsmithlaw.com  
Gillam & Smith, LLP  
303 South Washington Avenue  
Marshall, TX 75670  
Tel: (903) 934-8450  
Fax: (903) 934-9257

Hae-Chan Park  
hpark@park-law.com  
Jiri F. Smetana  
jsmetana@park-law.com  
HC Park & Associates PLC  
8500 Leesburg Pike, Suite 7500  
Vienna, VA 22182  
Tel: (703) 288-5105  
Fax: (703) 288-5139

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT PANTECH  
WIRELESS, INC.**

/s/ Michael E. Jones

Michael E. Jones  
State Bar No. 10929400  
mikejones@potterminton.com  
Allen F. Gardner  
State Bar No. 24043679  
allengardner@potterminton.com  
Potter Minton, P.C.  
110 N. College Ave., Suite 500  
Tyler, Texas 75702  
Tel: (903) 597-8311  
Fax: (903) 593-0846

David G. Wille  
david.wille@bakerbotts.com  
Samir A. Bhavsar  
samir.bhavsar@bakerbotts.com  
Baker Botts - Dallas  
2001 Ross Ave., Suite 600  
Dallas, TX 75201-2980  
Tel: (214) 953-6500

Fax: (214) 661-4737

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS HIGH  
TECH COMPUTER CORP. AND HTC  
AMERICA, INC.**

/s/ Melissa Richards Smith

(with permission by Michael E. Jones)

David C. Doyle  
ddoyle@mofo.com  
Edwin Dale Buxton, II  
dbuxton@mofo.com  
Gregory W. Reilly  
greilly@mofo.com  
M. Andrew Woodmansee  
mawoodmansee@mofo.com  
Thomas C. Chen  
tchen@mofo.com  
Morrison & Foerster - San Diego  
12531 High Bluff Dr., Suite 100  
San Diego, CA 92130  
Tel: (858) 720-5100  
Fax: (858) 720-5125

Melissa Richards Smith  
melissa@gillamsmithlaw.com  
Gillam & Smith, LLP  
303 South Washington Avenue  
Marshall, TX 75670  
Tel: (903) 934-8450  
Fax: (903) 934-9257

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS KYOCERA  
WIRELESS CORP. AND KYOCERA  
COMMUNICATIONS INC.**

/s/ Melissa Richards Smith

(with permission by Michael E. Jones)

Melissa Richards Smith  
melissa@gillamsmithlaw.com  
Gillam & Smith, LLP  
303 South Washington Avenue  
Marshall, TX 75670

Tel: (903) 934-8450  
Fax: (903) 934-9257

David C. Doyle  
ddoyle@mofo.com  
Edwin Dale Buxton, II  
dbuxton@mofo.com  
Gregory W. Reilly  
greilly@mofo.com  
M. Andrew Woodmansee  
mawoodmansee@mofo.com  
Thomas C. Chen  
tchen@mofo.com  
Morrison & Foerster - San Diego  
12531 High Bluff Dr., Suite 100  
San Diego, CA 92130  
Tel: (858) 720-5100  
Fax: (858) 720-5125

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT PALM, INC.**

/s/ Melissa Richards Smith  
(with permission by Michael E. Jones)

Melissa Richards Smith  
melissa@gillamsmithlaw.com  
Gillam & Smith, LLP  
303 South Washington Avenue  
Marshall, TX 75670  
Tel: (903) 934-8450  
Fax: (903) 934-9257

Alison M. Tucher  
atucher@mofo.com  
Morrison & Foerster LLP  
425 Market St., 32nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2482  
Tel: (415) 268-7269  
Fax: (415) 268-7522

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT  
UTSTARCOM, INC.**



**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system per Local Rule CV-5(a)(3) on May 26, 2010. Any other counsel of record will be served by First Class U.S. mail on this same date.

/s/ Michael E. Jones

Michael E. Jones